



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CURRENT OPINION

The Meaning of the Cup of Christ

In the *Interpreter* for April, 1915, Mr. A. D. Martin writes on "The Cup: An Interpretation of the Lord's Sacrifice." Christ spoke several times of his cup, pointing clearly to the coming Passion. Was it bodily pain or death? No, because pain or death itself had no terrors for Christ. Moreover, this same cup was to be drunk ultimately by the Lord's disciples and therefore the experience for which it stands cannot be foreign to the experience of godly men (Mark 10:39). Again, the act of drinking it leads on to the forgiveness of sins (Matt. 26:28). Ezekiel identified the drinking of a cup of wrath with the bearing of sin (Ezek. 23:32 ff.). Christ's cup, from which he shrank, was "the apprehension of a rising tide of sin all about Him, of sin as occasioned by Himself." His mission to save brought about a manifestation of sin in all its hideousness, through Judas and Peter and the Jewish priests and the mob; the cup was deep and large: it was the consciousness of human nature at its vilest—the sin of the world. The disciples had to drink of the same cup because men are not saved until the Savior meets them through the Christ-like. It is not a doctrine, nor a formula, nor a rite which redeems sinners, but the life of Christ communicated through a holy society—the Body of Christ in which Christ grows toward the world and draws men unto himself.

The Symbolism of Sacrifice

In the *Expositor* for May, 1915, Professor G. Buchanan Gray writes on "Interpretations of Jewish Sacrifice." The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews believed with Philo that the value of sacrifice did not lie in the sacrificial customs themselves but in what they signified. Philo taught that the actual command to offer flawless victims was

a matter largely indifferent as compared with the need that the offerer should himself be morally without blemish; so, but more directly, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews challenges the reality of morally redemptive virtue in the sacrifices demanded by the law, and declares that it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins. The sacrifices are only a shadow of the good things to come (Heb 10:1, 4). Philo and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews agree, therefore, in finding a symbolic interpretation, and at the same time a justification or explanation of the Jewish sacrificial system; but whereas with Philo the symbolism is pre-eminently didactic, with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews it is prophetic, or, rather, vaticinative.

Kipling's Ideal of a Preacher

In the *Methodist Review* for May, 1915, Mr. Downing writes on "Kipling's Men and the Minister." Kipling's men form a company of plain, common men with iron in their blood, faultlessly devoted to their appointed task. This is true—or ought to be true—of clergymen. Other men may fail and be forgiven; the man of God, never. He takes orders from above and yet he must be himself, original, unique, alone. His character is the reincarnation of the Christ who lives in the ever-present now, doing business in the most down-to-date moment the calendar of calculation conceives. The Christian minister must believe in the power behind the throne, and in the name and in the strength of the Almighty defy and smite the giants of Rum, Greed, Graft, and Sin.

The Preaching of Regeneration

In the *London Quarterly Review* for April, 1915, Principal P. T. Forsyth writes on "Veracity, Reality, and Regeneration."

Modern preachers are not inferior to those of the past and the sermons were never more interesting. And yet they do not win the public. Hence the restlessness that is observable in the ministry in various quarters, the sense of ineffectiveness, the desire to try a new soil with the same seed, in the hope that the Spirit may at last reward the effort. What is required most is not, however, a change of sphere but a change of note. The cause of the lack of power is the absence of a definite, positive, and commanding creed which holds us far more than we hold it, and, before we can do anything with it, does everything with us. Lack of penetrative power and of that inner moral passion which vivifies the work of a preacher is due to the general blurring of the features of truth in a nimbus of pious impressionism, or in a mist of social sympathy which impairs the individual conscience. Positive belief is not necessarily orthodoxy. A man may be very positive and creative with a gospel that permits many reputed heresies as to the Bible, the church, Christ, and the eternal future. These views may be peripheral, not essential. But let this man stand in the dynamic center of the grace that creates Bible, church, and salvation, as well as views about them; let him, if necessary, sell all the pearls of old tradition for this pearl of infinite price, which has all Christian doctrine; but let him avoid spiritual vagrancy and mental anarchy. Positive Christianity is a religion of redemption. To make atoms behave in cells postulates a special and peculiar cause, a distinct stream of energy which raises the inorganic to the organic. In like manner as life ascends to personality and society, a still newer stream of energy flows in, and finally, when personality rises to spirituality, what happens is a new birth, a new creation, as it were, and it is the work of the Holy Spirit. Why Nature was born is known only to the twice-born soul. What we need for our worship is the kind of power involved in a religion whose inmost nature of freedom and

wonder is miracle, i.e., creation. No amount of delightful talk about the love of God can regenerate a sinful race; probably we need kindness very often, but in our few great and decisive hours it is much more than kindness we need—the holy grace of the Almighty.

Bergson's Philosophy

In the *Methodist Review* (quarterly) for April, 1915, Mr. Elmer T. Clark writes on "Bergson's Contributions to Religious Thought." The great feature in nineteenth-century theological research is the work of biblical criticism and of its ally, archaeology; in spite of much opposition and misunderstanding, the critics have given us a more substantial Christianity which defies attacks like those of the eighteenth-century rationalists or deists. The nineteenth century was born under bad auspices: for the first time in history it seemed as if intellectual strength was on the side of skepticism and against orthodoxy. Consequently, during the nineteenth century there was a steady decline of spirituality. Several causes contributed to this: the drift of population cityward, the spirit of commercialism, the mistake of the church in lowering her standards, misunderstanding of the work of higher criticism, and the prevalence of materialistic philosophy. The nineteenth century did not understand the significance of life because it stressed the intellect out of all proportion. Lord Kelvin said that he could not understand a thing until he had made a working model of it. It was a typical attitude: since one cannot make a working model of life and its forces, science did not and could not understand it, and ignored it. The new recognition of spiritual forces has been brought about by men like Eucken and Bergson who are not churchmen, but who will perhaps create a new atmosphere of spiritual thought and life in which the church, disabled by nineteenth-century materialism, will flourish and regain her own. Henri Bergson, the world's greatest thinker, leads the way in the new spiritual

movement. He has vindicated human freedom by showing that the intuition by which we cling to freedom is more fundamental in reaching reality than the intellect which seems to prefer determinism. Again Bergson has shown that intellect cannot understand life, but happily intellect is not all of the mind; there is also instinct, which in man becomes conscious and evolves into intuition. We depend upon intuition for our grasp upon life and reality. Intuition has been rehabilitated, and with it revelation, which consists of the consecrated intuitions of prophets, poets, lawgivers, and holy men of God. Again Bergson has shown that evolution is creative, matter being the product of life—the spray that falls backward from the stream of life that spouts upward. “From all this,” in the words of Bergson himself, “there clearly emerges the idea of a God, creator and free.” Certain rationalists already complain that Bergson is too religious, as his *élan vital* (vital impulse) might just as well be called God.

The Resurrection

In the *Constructive Quarterly* for March, 1915, Dr. Max Meinertz writes on “The Fact of the Resurrection of Jesus.” The preaching of the resurrection of Jesus was the heart of the message of Paul and of the apostles. A certain number of theologians do not insist upon the historicity of the event and rather assume that the symbolical significance of the dogma of the resurrection is more important than the actual fact. The resurrection itself can have happened only in a miraculous way, and in the nature of the case was seen by no one. Therefore it eludes historical proof. But it can be established that on the first day of the week which followed the death of Jesus (a historically unquestioned event), the disciples asserted that the Lord had appeared to them and that moreover the tomb was empty. The apostle’s belief cannot be the result of subjective visions. A conviction resting on

more or less ecstatic conditions could hardly have made of the disciples such sober, efficient men who went through numberless sufferings and persecutions. A vision arises only when the content of the image lies hidden already in some fashion in the consciousness of the visionary. If this had been the case with the disciples, how can we explain the fact that many of them did not know the Risen One, and that they doubted and feared? How improbable was the appearance to five hundred brethren! If crowd-suggestions from history are brought into comparison, it will be found that these are connected with excitements of the multitude. But we are dealing here with a time when the disciples in Galilee had overcome the first terrors of the crucifixion scene. Besides, when on the day of Pentecost a certain religious excitement took place, there was no vision of the Risen One. Hence it can be maintained that the resurrection is the best-evidenced event in the history of antiquity; it belongs to universal history, it is a “fact that overcomes the world.”

The Evangelist Mark

In the *Expository Times* for May, 1915, Dr. S. J. Case contributes a study on “John Mark.” Apart from the title of the second gospel, Mark is mentioned only ten times in the New Testament: five times he is called Mark (Acts 15:39; Col. 4:10; Philem., vs. 24; II Tim. 4:11; I Pet. 5:13); three times he is referred to as “John whose surname was Mark” (Acts 12:12, 25; 15:37), and twice he is called simply John (Acts 13:5, 13). John was his Jewish name and Mark (Marcus) a Latin praenomen assumed by him in conformity with a custom prevailing among the Jews of that time. Similarly Saul of Tarsus assumed the cognomen Paulus (Acts 13:9). Only a meager outline of Mark’s career can be reconstructed from New Testament statements. His mother Mary was in sympathy with the disciples of Jesus and her house was probably a familiar place of meeting for

them, for Peter went directly there when he escaped from prison. Mark probably so-journeyed with Barnabas and Saul in Antioch, whence he accompanied them on their first so-called missionary journey; he did not proceed, however, farther than Perga, but returned to Jerusalem and later to Antioch, as it seems. He would have gone with them upon a second journey had not Paul refused his company. A split with Barnabas resulted and John Mark became the traveling companion of his cousin Barnabas. The latter continued to carry on aggressive evangelistic work (I Col. 9:6). There are a few hints suggesting that he was at one time with Paul in Rome, at another time in the East (II Tim. 4:11), and finally with Peter in Babylon (i.e., Rome). Mark is called an "attendant" of Paul and Barnabas and in that capacity had to attend to the minor duties in connection with the trip and make himself generally useful. Thus his rôle was similar to that of Timothy, Titus, and others. We cannot explain how Mark became in the end a most loyal supporter of Paul. Legend has been very busy with the life of Mark. He was supposed to have cut off his thumb in order to avoid service as a priest and to have been a disciple of Jesus, even one of the Seventy. He would have associated himself with Peter and become his interpreter. Eusebius declares also that he founded the church in Alexandria.

Modern Preaching of the Atonement

In the *Harvard Review* for April, 1915, Professor William F. Lofthouse writes on "The Atonement and the Modern Pulpit." If we may judge from the columns of reviews or the publishers' lists, interest in theology shows no sign of dying out. Much has been written on the atonement in the last half-century. It is indeed a vital question. Every conviction about God's relation to the world runs up into a conviction about what Christ has done for man. Yet ser-

mons on the atonement, like doctrinal sermons generally, are few and far between, and hymns on doctrine become as rare in our worship as hymns which embody an appeal for instantaneous conversion or hymns on the other world. Indeed, in treatises on the atonement there is a note of apologetic and even of apology, as if the doctrine itself were on trial. There are several factors which tell against any readiness to welcome a doctrine of the atonement: the momentous development of physical science, the idealist movement in philosophy, the modern devotion to historical study, the tendency to build up everything on experience and to test religion by ethical standards. The theme of religion, however, is communion with God in redemption, in obedience and service, and the joyful service of an ideal. Let us emphasize religion as service and we shall be able to emphasize religion as redemption. If salvation is a privilege to be received and enjoyed, the atonement may well seem a needless subtlety; but if salvation is also a responsibility, the case is different. As long as I am a person, God himself cannot make me able to do "at a clap" what was before out of my reach. A far more intimate process is necessary; the personality of someone else must invade my own, yet in such a way as to make my own personality more fully mine than it was before; this can be done only by the sacrifice that springs from another's purity and love. The human heart is stained with sin, a fact as real and as terrible among the respectable and church-going classes as among the outcast and criminal. Let the preaching of the atonement be on the lines of the ethical imperative of conduct, showing forth the individual and social ideals of a new life in communion with God and of a new world "wherein dwelleth righteousness," and the modern man, estranged from the doctrine of the atonement, by the qualities of his mind will be forced back to it by a consciousness of its defects.